

United States Patent and Trademark Office



UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS P.O. Box 1450 Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450 www.uspto.gov

DATE MAILED: 11/03/2005

APPLICATION NO. FILING DATE		FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/623,867	07/22/2003	Jari Hulkkonen	59643-00282	6401
32294	7590 11/03/2005	EXAMINER		
	NDERS & DEMPSE	WIMER, MICHAEL C		
14TH FLOOR 8000 TOWER		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
TYSONS CORNER, VA 22182			2828	

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

				r				
Office Action Summary		Applica	tion No.	n No. Applicant(s)				
		10/623,		HULKKONEN ET AL.				
		Examin	er	Art Unit				
			C. Wimer	2828				
Period fo	The MAILING DATE of this communication Reply	on appears on t	he cover sheet with the c	orrespondence ad	idress			
WHIC - Exte after - If NC - Failu Any	ORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR CHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILInsions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communical openiod for reply is specified above, the maximum statutor ire to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, be reply received by the Office later than three months after the patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	NG DATE OF CFR 1.136(a). In no tion. y period will apply and y statute, cause the a	THIS COMMUNICATION event, however, may a reply be tin will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from pplication to become ABANDONE	N. nely filed the mailing date of this c D (35 U.S.C. § 133).				
Status								
	Responsive to communication(s) filed or	8/11/2005						
· —	Responsive to communication(s) filed on <u>8/11/2005</u> . This action is FINAL . 2b) This action is non-final.							
′=								
ا (۵	closed in accordance with the practice under <i>Ex parte Quayle</i> , 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.							
Dispositi	ion of Claims	,	,,					
· _		aatian						
	Claim(s) 1-34 is/are pending in the application.							
	4a) Of the above claim(s) is/are withdrawn from consideration.							
·	Claim(s) is/are allowed.							
	Claim(s) <u>1-34</u> is/are rejected.							
7)	Claim(s) is/are objected to.	and/or alastian	roguiroment					
اـــا(ه	Claim(s) are subject to restriction	and/or election	requirement.					
Applicati	on Papers							
9)[The specification is objected to by the Ex	aminer.						
10)☐ The drawing(s) filed on is/are: a)☐ accepted or b)☐ objected to by the Examiner.								
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).								
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).								
11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.								
Priority ι	ınder 35 U.S.C. § 119							
	12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).							
a)	☐ All b)☐ Some * c)☐ None of:							
	 Certified copies of the priority documents have been received. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No 							
					0.			
	3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage							
. * c	application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).							
* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.								
Attachmen	t(s)							
	e of References Cited (PTO-892)		4) Interview Summary					
	e of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-9 nation Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO		Paper No(s)/Mail Da 5) Notice of Informal P		O-152)			
	r No(s)/Mail Date	<i>Jaivaj</i>	6) Other:		,			

DETAILED ACTION

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

- 1. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:
 - (a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negatived by the manner in which the invention was made.
- 2. Claims 1-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Martek (6268828).

Regarding Claims 1,9-12 and 24-34 Martek shows an antenna arrangement, for example in Fig. 9, comprising at least two antennas for providing coverage to a plurality of mobile units (e.g., cellular phones within a cell system network) and having at least two different antennas 2x-1,2x-2 and 2x-3,2x-4, provided with a plurality of frequencies within the band of operation, providing two separate phase centers for each antenna, thus, defining "different antennas", where a different beam-tilt is provided (see col. 16, lines 41-50), the adjusting means 530a (col. 16, lines 51-62) provides for dynamically adjusting transmission properties of the lower antenna. It would have been obvious to the skilled artisan that the lower antenna provides for distribution of users within the area covered by the beam therefrom, particularly since separate and different phase centers are associated with each respective antenna array.

The use of allocating means, dynamically as claimed, is provided by allocating at least one user equipment to the group of users in the area noted above (i.e., the

Application/Control Number: 10/623,867

Art Unit: 2828

beam with the most beam tilt). A skilled artisan would have found it obvious that allocating means comprises the network disclosed by Martek, where an individual cellular phone is allocated a frequency pair, has an identification within the network and thus utilizes the particular beam (either one having varying degrees of beam-tilt). Such a condition derives a dynamically adjusted transmission property for a particular antenna array.

Page 3

Regarding Claims 2 and 4, the antennas, frequency pairs/groups and groups of users are associated with particular beams and frequencies. A skilled artisan would have found it obvious that these conditions obtain in order for the network to handle all calls associated with the radio units. Regarding Claims 3,5-8 and 13-23, a skilled artisan would have found it obvious that the users are associated with respective layers, corresponding to the beams, and their frequency pairs associated with their groups of users within respective cells.

Response to Arguments

3. Applicant's arguments filed 8/10/2005 have been fully considered but they are not persuasive. Specifically, the arrays in Martek are divided by radiation properties and connection to the circuitry. The arrays that provide two separate and distinct phase centers define two antennas, as claimed. The structure is shown in Martek that provides the functions recited in the present claims. Providing two separate arrays of antenna elements, i.e., upper and lower arrays, having distinctive phase centers certainly qualifies as two antennas. Martek teaches at column 16, third paragraph, that the two phase centers are utilized to provide elevation steering. The fourth paragraph in

column 16 provides the skilled artisan with the suggestion of adjusting, dynamically, the electrical down-tilt, as claimed. A skilled artisan would have found it obvious to divide the arrays, having separate phase centers, in order to dynamically steer the respective beams to the respective users. Since all structure has been shown and evidence of obviousness has been set forth, the rejection stands.

Conclusion

4. **THIS ACTION IS MADE FINAL.** Applicant is reminded of the extension of time policy as set forth in 37 CFR 1.136(a).

A shortened statutory period for reply to this final action is set to expire THREE MONTHS from the mailing date of this action. In the event a first reply is filed within TWO MONTHS of the mailing date of this final action and the advisory action is not mailed until after the end of the THREE-MONTH shortened statutory period, then the shortened statutory period will expire on the date the advisory action is mailed, and any extension fee pursuant to 37 CFR 1.136(a) will be calculated from the mailing date of the advisory action. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of this final action.

5. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Michael C. Wimer whose telephone number is (571) 272-1833. The examiner can normally be reached on M-F.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Minsun O. Harvey can be reached on (571) 272-1835. The fax phone

Art Unit: 2828

number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see http://pair-direct.uspto.gov. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Michael C. Wimer Primary Examiner Art Unit 2828

MCW 10/25/2005